



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*mn*  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/927,096	08/09/2001	Ghim-Sim Chua	50037.5USU1	3792

27488 7590 06/20/2007  
MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT)  
P.O. BOX 2903  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER
----------

LY, ANH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2162

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/20/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Interview Summary

Application No.

09/927,096

Applicant(s)

CHUA ET AL.

Examiner

Anh Ly

Art Unit

2162

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Anh Ly.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Mr. Ryan T. Grace (Reg. No.: 52,956).

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: THU 06/14/2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: all independent claims 1, 7, 13, 21 and 29 and dependent claims 2 and 3.Identification of prior art discussed: PATNO: 7,058,626 of Pan et al.Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☒ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants' representative agreed to make amendment to clarify the search engine wrappers and search engine manager by incorporating the claims 2 and 3 into all independent claims in order to overcome the applied references. Also, he amends the spec. on page 4 for clarifying "computer readable storage medium" differing from communication media, as well as in all claims related to "computer-readable storage medium."

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Anh Ly

Examiner's signature, if required

**Merchant & Gould**

An Intellectual Property Law Firm

Merchant & Gould P.C.  
701 Fifth Avenue  
Suite 4100  
Seattle, WA 98104-7097

A Professional Corporation

**Fax Transmission**

May 14, 2007

TO:

Attn: Examiner Anh Ly  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

FROM: Ryan T. Grace

OUR REF: 50037.05USU1

Total pages, including cover letter: 4

PTO FAX NUMBER 1-571-273-4039

If you do NOT receive all of the pages, please telephone us at 206.342.6200, or fax us at 206.342.6201.

Title of Document Transmitted: Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Applicant: Ghim-Sim Chua et al.

Serial No.: 09/927,096

Filed: August 9, 2001

Group Art Unit: 2162

Our Ref. No. 50037.05USU1

Confirmation No. 3792

By:

Name: Ryan T. Grace

Reg. No.: 52,956

I hereby certify that this paper is being transmitted by facsimile to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

Tracy Gutscher

Signature

Date

**Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form**

Application No.: 09/927,096

First Named Applicant: Chua

Examiner: Ly

Art Unit: 2162

Status of Application: Pending

**Tentative Participants:**

(1) Examiner Ly

(2)

(3) Ryan Grace

(4)

**Proposed Date of Interview:** Please call      **Proposed Time:** Please call**Type of Interview Requested:**(1) ☒ Telephonic      (2) ☐ Personal      (3) ☐ Video Conference**Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes      ☐ No

If yes, provide brief description:

---

**Issues To Be Discussed**

---

(1) 103 Rejection

(2)

☐ Continuation Sheet Attached

Independent claim 1 includes the following combination of features not taught or otherwise suggested by the cited references:

a search engine manager configured to receive a search query from a client, access a search engine store to determine search engine wrappers that have registered a wrapper identifier with the search engine manager, and to translate the search query to a standard query, wherein the standard query is universally formatted for a plurality of search engine wrappers that have registered the wrapper identifier with the search engine manager, and to communicate the standard query from the search engine manager to each of the plurality of search engine wrappers that have registered the wrapper identifier with the search engine manager; and

each of the search engine wrappers being configured to translate the standard query to a native format query of a registered search engine associated with the search engine wrapper, wherein each of the search engine wrappers translates the standard query into a different native format, and to communicate the native format query to the registered search engine, the search engine wrapper being further configured to

return results from the registered search engine to the search engine manager.

The above combination of features is not taught in the cited references. The Office Action argues that Pan teaches the features of the search engine manager by teaching "receiving user input the query and then translate user input into a language that the search engines can accept and construct query command." See *Office Action* at pg. 4. This assertion leaves out many of the features of the cited search engine manager. For example, claim 1 states that the configuration manager translates "the search query to a standard query, wherein the standard query is universally formatted for a plurality of search engine wrappers that have registered the wrapper identifier with the search engine manager." Pan does not teach such a feature. Pan teaches translating the language (e.g. Chinese to English) of a query at a broker. The query is translated and provided directly to the search engine. Pan does not teach a standard query that is universally formatted for a plurality of search engine wrappers. Moreover, to have such a feature in Pan would destroy the very functionality of Pan's invention. The very purpose of Pan is to have the broker translate the query for a particular search engine. If the query from the client was translated to a universally formatted query, Pan would not be functional.

The Office Action also argues that Pan teaches that "every search engine uses a dedicated language or different native format language and translating the query into a native format to communicate with the respective search engine." This assertion leaves out many of the features of claim 1. The argument references the search engine. However, the cited portion of the claim pertains to the search engine wrapper. The argument in the Office Action has the search engine translating the search query and then communicating with itself to receive results from itself. Essentially, the Office Action is stating that the search engine is communicating with itself. This interpretation of the prior art and claim 1 is incorrect. The claims specifically set forth a "search engine manager", "a plurality of search engine wrappers," and a "search engine." The rejection attempts to piece together various functions that simply are not associated with the features as recited in claim 1. Moreover, to have such a wrapper in Pan would destroy the very functionality of Pan's invention. The very purpose of Pan is to have the broker translate the query for a particular search engine. If the query from the client was translated to a universally formatted query, Pan would not be functional.

Furthermore, claim 1 has been amended to clarify that features associated with a "wrapper identifier." Applicants can find no such teaching in Pan or the other references. The Office Action relies on Chidlovskii in attempt to remedy the lack of teaching in Pan. Chidlovskii teaches a metadata search engine for ranking documents. With regard to a wrapper, Chidlovskii teaches that "[a]dditionally, the extended system may include wrappers that allow profilers to extract document content (or document reference, such as its URL), user, community and rating information from the document collects and wrappers that allow the search pre-processor to submit queries to the search engine and the search post-processor to extract the results." *Chidlovskii*, at col. 4, lines 46-55. Chidlovskii does not teach any of the functionality. Claim 1 specifically recites "each of the search engine wrappers being configured to translate the standard query to a native format query of a registered search engine associated with the search engine wrapper,

wherein each of the search engine wrappers translates the standard query into a different native format, and to communicate the native format query to the registered search engine, the search engine wrapper being further configured to return results from the registered search engine to the search engine manager." Accordingly, applicants assert that claim 1 is allowable.

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on \_\_\_\_\_. NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

 5/8  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner/SPE Signature

Ryan T. Grace  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative

52,956  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Registration Number, if applicable